

# WICHITA AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

## August 11, 2005 Meeting

### Attendance

#### *Members Present:*

Morris Dunlap, Chair  
Harold Warner, Vice-Chair  
Bob Aldrich  
Jay Banasiak  
James Barfield  
Elizabeth Bishop  
Darrell Downing  
Bud Hentzen  
Chris Herrick *Ex Officio Member*  
Ronald Marnell  
M.S. Mitchell  
Clark Nelson  
Denise Sherman  
Dee Stuart

#### *Members Absent:*

James Ford  
Gary K. Gibbs  
Hoyt Hillman  
Bill Johnson  
John McKay  
James (Jim) Singletary

#### *Others Attending:*

John Schlegel, Director, MPO/ MAPD  
Nancy Harvieux, MPO  
Bhupendra Patel, MPO  
Aprajit Desai, MPO  
Purab Adabala, MPO

Aruna Reddi, MPO  
Srikanth Yamala, MPO  
Thomas Dow, KDOT  
Jim Tobaben, PBQ&D, Inc.

1. Call meeting to order – Chairman, WAMPO.

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Dunlap-Chair of the Wichita Area Metropolitan Planning Organization, held in the Planning Department Conference Room, 10<sup>th</sup> floor, City Hall, 455 N Main, Wichita KS.

2. Approval of Minutes of the July 28, 2005 meeting.

Mr. Dunlap asked if there were any additions or corrections to the minutes, seeing none the minutes were approved as presented.

***ACTION: Mr. Downing motioned to approve the July 28, 2005 Minutes. Mr. Mitchell seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.***

3. Presentation of the Final Draft of the WAMPO Bylaws; presentation by Nancy Harvieux.

Ms. Harvieux gave the Policy Body a brief overview of the activities in the development of the WAMPO Bylaws. She advised the members that a rough draft of the Bylaws was presented in March, at which time the Policy Body established a Subcommittee to address this issue. The Subcommittee met twice, the first time was to review the initial document, the second time to finalize the document for presentation to the Policy Body. She advised the members that the City and County Legal Departments were involved throughout the process. She stated that at the final Subcommittee meeting, members recommended the document be forwarded to the Policy Body for approval. She further advised the members that staff would be returning to the Policy Body on August 25th to ask that the Bylaws be adopted as recommended by the Subcommittee. Mr. Marnell advised that he Chaired the Subcommittee and that it was the recommendation the Policy Body review and adopt the Bylaws as presented.

Mr. Dunlap gave an approval to proceed to place the item on the next Agenda for adoption of the WAMPO Bylaws, and following adopt of the Bylaws election of officers could be scheduled.

4. Discuss and review the Draft Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), presentation by James Tobaben, Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas (Consultant).

Ms. Harvieux asked the Policy Body for input on the final draft of the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). She also mentioned this meeting would allow the public, if any, to stand up and speak to the Policy Body on this issue. Ms. Harvieux added that this isn't a public meeting, but an opportunity for the public to directly address the Policy Body on this issue.

Mr. Tobaben advised the members of the recent public involvement activities and the Advisory Committee activities. He stated that there have been no new comments as a result of the public involvement and that the Advisory Committee had recommended the LRTP be taken to the Policy Body for review and eventually adoption. He advised the public comment period began on July 29 and will run through August 19, 2005. Comments from this opportunity will be considered in the final plan, but it is unlikely given the expansive public involvement that anything new will arise.

Mr. Marnell addressed questions about the language on pages 1-2 and 1-3, Goal # 2.2 bullet 2. He voiced concern that he had been advised this item was targeted at a specific area, and could result in impeding the progress of development. He advised he felt this bullet had the possibility of holding up progress, which may impact the safety of the entire community and region.

Mr. Marnell understood that the bullet statement was there for a regional standpoint and not a particular jurisdiction, but mentioned that it could end up protecting interests of a particular group, though it might not be in the interest of the region as a whole. He asked the statement be modified to reflect the intent of the region and not a particular jurisdiction. Mr. Marnell furthered that he would prefer a change in the wording or the removal of the entire bullet point. After discussion of possible rewordings, it was decided that the previous bullet addressed this issue suitably and this bullet could be removed. State representatives stated this action would not constitute a major change.

**ACTION: Mr. Marnell motioned to strike and remove the bullet point that starts with “Ensures the transportation improvements.” Mr. Mitchell seconded the motion.**

Mr. Nelson supported the motion. Ms. Bishop abstained.

**Motion carried 12-0-1. Bishop abstains.**

Mr. Marnell had asked about goal five, regarding sidewalks discussion from the LRTP Advisory Committee meeting. Mr. Tobaben advised that the issue was resolved in the draft.

Mr. Dunlap asked if the LRTP would impact or restrict the CIP at any level of government. Ms. Harvieux explained that the LRTP isn't a policy document and it only guides the overall region with concepts for the future transportation planning.

Mr. Schlegel asked Ms. Harvieux to explain the link between the LRTP and the TIP. Ms. Harvieux explained that the TIP covers three-years by regulation, and the MPO includes additional two years for planning purposes. The first three years have to be fiscally constrained and the projects listed have been selected for federal funds. Ms. Harvieux further explained that the LRTP is the umbrella for the MPO and the TIP projects need to be consistent with the LRTP.

Mr. Dunlap had a concern on whether LRTP could be incorporated in the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Schlegel explained that it would be ideal for each jurisdiction to incorporate or refer to the LRTP in their Comprehensive Plan. However, he stated that LRTP should be a standalone document according to federal regulations.

Mr. Banasiak had suggested including Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) in the LRTP goals. Mr. Banasiak advised that if the region becomes a non-attainment, then BRT should be looked as an option. Mr. Marnell suggested including “BRT” under goal number 4-2, “study the feasibility of providing public transportation services to outlying communities”. Ms. Harvieux suggested including BRT as a second bullet, as long as it is to study the need. State representation stated addition of a study would not require further public involvement.

**ACTION: Mr. Banasiak moved to put in a second bullet point to study the feasibility of Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) within the planning area. Mr. Aldrich seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously. 13-0.**

5. Other items.

Ms. Harvieux asked the members to review the WAMPO roster and advise staff of any necessary corrections. She also advised that the WAMPO packets would be mailed two weeks prior to the meeting date to give the Policy Body ample time for review.

6. Adjournment.

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 12:55 p.m.